

**Committee on Diversity
Minutes
April 8th, 2013**

Committee Members Present: Amy Ryken (chair); Lisa Ferrari, John Lear, Mark Martin, Aislinn Melchior, Czarina Ramsey, Hannah Smith (student representative), George Tomlin, Carolyn Weisz.

Intro/Discussion of minutes:

Chair Ryken called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. There was ample discussion of the previous Diversity Committee minutes in several areas. Carolyn Weisz made several suggestions for clarity, accuracy, and word use. George Tomlin corrected the title of a department. John Lear discussed issues in the previous minutes, attempting to broaden statements that could be perceived as promoting a specific political bias (which lead to some further discussion via Carolyn Weisz). George Tomlin added thoughts to that discussion. Further discussion took place on what is perceived as political bias versus world view versus inquiry in the classroom. Attempts were made to reach across disciplinary differences in pedagogy, with suggestions on specific rephrasing via Amy Ryken.

Following approval of the previous meeting's minutes with suggested editing, format of the meeting included (i) announcements, (ii) review/approval of the Annual Report, and (iii) discussion of the proposed changes in curricula campus-wide.

Announcements:

- Czarina Ramsey announced dates for Lavender Commencement (17 May at 4:30 PM), with the Keynote Speaker being Harry Velez Quinones, and the Graduates of Color ceremony (18 May at 4:30 PM) with Marilyn Strickland as Keynote Speaker.
- Czarina Ramsey discussed the response of BHERT to the graffiti issue on wooden desks. The approach will use a "PR" or publicity campaign, appealing to students: the expense of clean up, the way the community looks, etc. A three pronged effort is proposed: (i) a statement to have faculty read to students in the impacted areas on campus, (ii) a poster campaign, and (iii) a video campaign. "Break the cycle: don't doodle" as a theme. ASUPS will be lead on this effort, to promote a community building approach.
- Amy Ryken distributed "Inclusive/Safe Space" posters to be placed in offices and laboratories, to remind students that such places are "safe havens" for students from a wide variety of backgrounds.

Review/approval of the Annual Report to the Faculty Senate:

- Amy Ryken will be presenting the annual report from the Committee on Diversity to the Faculty Senate this afternoon.
- George Tomlin pointed out that the Senate's "charge" to the committee does not ask for a concise rationale for a divisional requirement. He recommended that a short statement detailing the rationale could be placed just before the "Approaches" section.
- Carolyn Weisz suggested borrowing language from a recent "Wednesdays at Four" session relating to diversity issues.
- George Tomlin wondered if (on page seven) the term "promise" could be strengthened to "endorse."

- Carolyn Weisz discussed that while two units of diversity related curriculum for all students has developmental advantages, an acceptance of at least one unit would be a place to start to create a more accepting environment toward a two unit model. Thus, a developmental approach would lead eventually to a two-unit model, with elements of diversity seen as integral to the overall education of students here.
- George Tomlin felt that this discussion was similar to debate over a “two science courses” model in the old Core proposals. Then as now, the issues that need addressing are practical as well as pedagogical: resources (faculty and support), placement in the Core program, workload, etc.
- Czarina Ramsey suggested that the second diversity related unit could be something like a “capstone course.”
- Amy Ryken suggested that the order of presentation in the memo to program leaders should be: two course requirement model first, then the one course model.
- Lisa Ferrari discussed this further, suggesting that a few sentences could be added advocating for the two course model.
- Carolyn Weisz wanted to know if there was any kind of analysis of faculty resources (money, coverage, etc) as they relate to either model.
- Aislinn Melchior brought up the practicalities of designing such courses in general.
- Carolyn Weisz and Amy Ryken announced that a Burlington-Northern grant has been submitted for Summer 2013 to allow faculty to create defined learning outcomes, a draft rubric, assessment strategies, and ways of framing language in this context

ACTION: The Committee approved the annual report to the Faculty Senate.

Diversity requirement/curricular change discussion:

The focus here was on the upcoming Chairs Meeting on the 24th of April, and what approaches were thought to be most effective.

- Despite the implied cynicism, do we know attendees will read materials beforehand? Is it better to assume not for a presentation?
- A PowerPoint presentation strategy was thought to be a good approach, of perhaps 15 minutes in length.
- Hannah Smith suggested directly including “student voices” essays in support of the proposal as part of the presentation. Hannah Smith read several samples of these “student voices” which were deemed powerful and convincing.
- Some discussion followed regarding proper placement of the “student voices” in the presentation.
- Carolyn Weisz wondered if faculty would feel inhibited by student presence in this venue, though agreeing that student input should be included.
- Lisa Ferrari urged that the process should not be derailed by negativity by the audience (if that occurred). She felt that language making it clear that socioeconomic barriers are part of the diversity equation, hoping to broaden the definitions.
- Some discussion of the above took place, with some members feeling that (based on prior discussions) some factions of the audience will find a “focus” on race and gender to be limiting, while other members were insistent that current model of diversity was indeed inclusive beyond race and gender. Regardless, the goal was to get as many Chairs “on board” with the proposal as possible.

- John Lear reminded members of the diversity language that Carolyn Weisz had used earlier that was quite inclusive.
- Aislinn Melchior supported a “diversity overlay” model that underscored the applicability of the definitions used toward diversity and equity in general.

ACTION: The Committee approved the memo. This memo will be distributed to Chairs, Deans, and Directors in advance of the April 24 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Martin

TO: Chairs, Deans, and Directors (April 10, 2013)

FM: Committee on Diversity

Lisa Ferrari, John Lear, Mark Martin, Aislinn Melchior, Margi Nowak, Czarina Ramsay,
Amy Ryken (chair), George Tomlin, Carolyn Weisz, Hannah Smith (student member)

CC: Curriculum Committee via Tatiana Kaminsky (chair)

RE: Diversity in the Curriculum

For the past two years the Committee on Diversity (CoD) has engaged in work related to diversity and the curriculum at Puget Sound. In Fall 2012 the Faculty Senate charged the committee to:

- Research whether and how peer and next step institutions integrate a diversity requirement in the curriculum; and
- Make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum.

The University of Puget Sound Diversity Strategic Plan defines social diversity as: Characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be systematically excluded from full participation in higher education, including age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, sexual orientation, job status or socioeconomic class, personal appearance, and political beliefs.

CoD is in the process of gathering information about diversity in the curriculum at Puget Sound and will work collaboratively with the newly hired Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer to bring forward a proposal during the 2013-2014 academic year. Below is a brief summary of our efforts and findings to date, as well as questions for your consideration and discussion. We invite you to discuss this information with departmental colleagues in advance of the April 24, 2013 chair meeting.

Analysis of Peer and Next Step Institutions

From our inquiry of curriculum descriptions on university websites we learned that two peer institutions and five next steps institutions have a diversity requirement in place. Many have had these requirements since the early 1990's. In addition, we examined the diversity requirements of three premier institutions and four non-peer institutions. Conceptual framings of diversity include Cultural Differences, International/Global Perspectives, U.S. Multiculturalism, and Social Justice/Anti-Oppression. See Appendix A for a complete listing of colleges and course descriptions of the requirements.

Analysis of 5-Year Curriculum Review Question

In order to understand how diversity is currently conceptualized in the curriculum, the CoD reviewed responses from all academic departments to the question about diversity in the curriculum (2005-2012). The 5-year curriculum review question about diversity in the curriculum was revised and approved by the CoD and the Curriculum Committee in Spring 2012.

Old Question: In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?

New Question: How does your department, school, or program engage diversity in relation to recruitment, curriculum, pedagogy, professional membership/career trajectories, and/or interactions with students?

Review of responses indicated that Departments conceptually frame diversity in different ways. The majority of departments reported framing diversity as it is described in the university mission statement, with a focus on issues that reflect "appreciation of commonality and difference" (18 departments) or

“rich knowledge of self and others” (4 departments). These approaches focus on understandings of diverse individuals and cultures, but not explicitly on systemic issues of power, oppression, and privilege. Some departments framed diversity in ways that addressed systemic issues such as conflict and stratification (9 departments) or domestic and global dynamics of diversity (4 departments).

Responses also indicated that Departments think about engaging diversity in the curriculum in a variety of ways. Most Departments framed diversity in terms of course content, although other approaches were also mentioned:

- listing specific courses (21/33= 64%)
- describing recruitment and retention for faculty and students (8/33=24%)
- hosting events, visiting scholars, speakers (7/33=21%)
- noting specific assignments (6/33=18%)
- coordinating community involvement (5/33=15%)
- requiring specific courses (3/33=9%)
- other approaches (2/33=6% each): supporting study abroad; collaborating with interdisciplinary programs; engagement with the Race and Pedagogy Initiative; faculty research, classroom learning environments.

Analysis of Diversity Curriculum Resource

In 2009-2010 the Diversity Advisory Council inventoried the Puget Sound curriculum for courses that addressed issues of social diversity (self-identified by department chairs and/or faculty teaching the courses); although the inventory did not include all departments or courses, 198 diversity-related courses were identified. See the complete list at: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/diversity-curriculum/>. Although this list is outdated, it demonstrates that many departments already offer courses related to the facets of identity identified in the campus definition of social diversity.

Analysis of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Data

The CoD worked collaboratively with the Office of Institutional Research to review existing data about students’ perspectives about diversity in the curriculum. We selected one item for inclusion here: “Diverse perspectives (e.g., different races, religions, genders, political belief, etc.) were often included in class discussion or writing assignments.” Analyzing two cohort groups (2004-2008 and 2007-2011) revealed that 74% of first year students and 74% of seniors marked often or very often to this item. Our national peer institutions show a similar pattern with a slightly lower percentage of 69%. A generous read of this data is that three-quarters of the student body report that diverse perspectives are already included in the curriculum. A skeptical read of this data is that there is no change in perception from first year to senior year—no value added over a three-year period. In addition, multiple facets of identity are included and the concepts of power, oppression and privilege are not suggested in the item thus making it difficult to identify key areas of existing strength in the curriculum.

Purposes for Including Considerations of Diversity in the Curriculum

The purposes for integrating considerations of diversity, difference and disparity into students’ required educational experiences were well articulated in the written description of the April 3, 2013 Wednesday at 4 conversation, “Over the last few decades faculty, staff and students have repeatedly asked whether the university’s core curriculum or graduation requirements should include some form of diversity education. Our stated mission of preparing students for democratic citizenship, our ethical responsibility to a rigorous and broad liberal arts education, and our expanding sense of commitment to membership in our community, provide a basis for such a curricular imperative. Also, the changing

demographics of the nation that we are coming to publicly recognize in the twenty-first century gives us a critical opportunity to rethink and redress our historical and moral missteps in our journey toward an equitable, inclusive, and just educational system and society. In light of all this, many on campus believe it is no longer productive to ask if this kind of change to the curriculum is needed, but rather time to think about how we might implement it.”

Approaches to Including Diversity in the Curriculum

The CoD considered three new approaches to including diversity in the curriculum. Two models do not seem well suited for implementation:

- 1) Designing one required common course (extremely resource intensive)
- 2) Creating an optional diversity pathway within the core or within departments (this approach would not reach all students).

We endorse a third model—an overlay model. Overlay courses could be designated within the core, within the major, and/or in non-major offerings including internships and/or independent study. Departments would have the option to develop and/or require particular courses suited to majors. We propose two versions of the overlay model for discussion:

- Two diversity and equity overlay courses as a requirement for graduation (one lower division and one upper division course). We see the advantage of this model as providing more sustained engagement with these issues early and later in students’ academic careers.
- One diversity and equity overlay course as a requirement for graduation

Goals for Student Learning/Experience

Whether as an overlay requirement or in some other form, a diversity requirement would need to be framed clearly with rubrics that reflect goals for student learning and that provide guidance for course development and evaluation by the Curriculum Committee. These rubrics should reflect, first and foremost, the learning goals we think are important for our students. A Burlington Northern proposal has been submitted to create a working group in Summer 2013 to 1) articulate learning outcomes of a requirement of a course that interrogates questions of equity and injustice, 2) develop options for framing language and weigh the pros and cons of each framing, 3) create a draft rubric to use to evaluate proposed courses.

Example of a Diversity and Equity Overlay Requirement:

Courses fulfilling a “Diversity and Equity” requirement will include among other course components, a sustained focus on systemic issues of power, privilege, exclusion, and equity as they relate to differences among social groups and challenges of possessing multiple identities in a domestic and/or international context. Students taking the course will gain an understanding of how these issues relate to intergroup relations, allyship, ethics, arts, environmental degradation, distribution of resources, and/or the functioning of institutions in society (e.g., education, healthcare) and will interrogate the complexities of their own social position.

Analysis of Resources

As with any changes to program or graduation requirements, sufficient staffing resources will be needed. CoD recommends that an analysis of resources be conducted, including an assessment of existing resources (e.g., courses within and outside of the core) and consideration of how the requirement might affect current departmental and core offerings. Care should be taken so that this requirement does not become the responsibility of a narrow set of departments or negatively impact departments that are already disproportionately taxed by core requirements or insufficient staffing to

meet departmental needs. CoD recommends that instructors and departments voluntarily nominate courses and course-development strategies that would benefit, or at least not negatively impact, their programs.

Questions for Discussion

At the April 24 meeting we are interested to hear your responses to our findings and ideas so far, as well as your perspectives on the questions below.

- What conceptual framing of diversity should guide our thinking about diversity in the curriculum? Why? How do these frames reflect particular goals for student learning?
- What framing language other than “diversity” might we use to describe these efforts?
- How would students’ experiences in your major change as a result of a diversity requirement? What benefits can you imagine? What drawbacks?
- Our analysis is based, in part, on reports from 5-year curriculum review documents. What are you already doing beyond what this data shows us?

Appendix A: Diversity Requirements at Peer, Next Step and Premier Institutions

Peer Institutions	
<p><u>Have diversity requirement</u> Whitman College—cultural pluralism (underrepresented perspectives)</p> <p>Willamette University—understanding society core class</p>	<p><u>Do not have diversity requirement</u> Lewis & Clark Reed</p>
Next Step Institutions	
<p><u>Have diversity requirement</u> Barnard College—cultures in comparison core (compares two or more cultures)</p> <p>Colgate College—global engagements core (conditions and effects of cross-cultural interactions) & communities and identities core (textured view of identities, cultures and social life)</p> <p>Macalester College—internationalism (study of people and systems outside the US) and US multiculturalism (study of social group and forces that shape power and identity) core requirements</p> <p>Mount Holyoke—multicultural perspective (study of: a) the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East; or b) peoples of color in Australia, Europe, or North America; or c) peoples in North America whose primary language is other than English)</p> <p>Oberlin College—cultural diversity requirement of nine credit hours (emphasis on cultures who lie outside the Western tradition, or cultural differences, or cultural pluralism)</p>	<p><u>Do not have diversity requirement</u> Bates College Connecticut College Hamilton College (has no core requirements) Kenyon College Smith College Trinity College</p>
Selected Premier Institutions	
<p><u>Have diversity requirement</u> Bowdoin College—exploring social difference (examining difference across and within societies with focus on social, political and economic processes) and international perspectives (contemporary and historical understanding of world outside U.S.) core requirements</p> <p>Carleton College—global citizen requirement includes a) proficiency in language other than English, b) international studies requirement (engage world’s peoples and problems from multiple perspectives), and c) intercultural domestic studies (role of identity and status in shaping disparate experiences of peoples in the U.S.)</p> <p>Colby College—diversity requirements—one course focused on U.S. one focused on context outside U.S. with attention to structures, political and cultural change, and progress in overcoming prejudice, privilege, oppression, inequality, and injustice.</p>	

Note: Non-Peer Institutions that have a diversity requirement include George Fox College, Pacific Lutheran University, Linfield College and Luther College.

Appendix B: Puget Sound Student Reflections on Diversity in the Curriculum

Hannah Smith (Student Member on the Committee on Diversity) invited members of the Class of 2014, including student leaders who serve in ASUPS, on diversity initiatives, in Greek Life, and on sexual harassment/violence initiatives to share their reflections about integrating a diversity component in the curriculum. Below we share a few representative reflections. To add to these reflections, in late April 2013 Institutional Research will hold focus group conversations with graduating seniors, one topic of discussion will be how students have experienced diversity in the curriculum.

I think every student here on campus understands that our university tries to be inclusive of every single student on this campus. Most of them probably understand the importance of diversity, while others have fully developed opinions as to what Diversity really means and why it's significant today. However, I think that most students would agree that we are NOT a diverse campus. . . . There's a big gap of education regarding gender, race, and religious beliefs in our campus, and when students start a dialog about these issues only a few have the necessary knowledge to engage in meaningful discussion. . . . I firmly think that by having this extra requirement, students will at least have a better knowledge and understanding of what diversity means and why is currently significant to us all.

While filming a promotional video for Take Back the Night . . . , we asked students what they could do to make the Puget Sound campus safer. A large number of people brought up education I feel as though a lot of people are uncomfortable when it comes to talking about diversity and equity, so they abstain from conversation relating to the topic I believe that with education comes understanding and an increased comfort level with the topic that was learned. Therefore, I think it is important to create a "Diversity and Equity" core so that students, faculty, and staff members can have more constructive discussions pertaining to diversity on the Puget Sound campus.

A diversity core is key to helping students not only "learn the scripts" but really engage with and understand the importance of alternative histories and lived experiences. Intersectionality is key to any body of knowledge and the University is doing students a disservice by not already requiring a diversity component in the curriculum.

Gender 201 was a great experience for me and I've found myself seeing everything now through a gendered lens, and it would be great to have a class that helps students recognize that there are multiple ways to approach subjects and issues in general.

A diversity requirement would expose students to the important and relevant diversity questions that we as a society face every day on and off campus through the different disciplines. I also think the diversity requirement would highlight the very unique academic focus that Puget Sound has to offer, both to prospective students visiting campus and to current students.

As a Gender Studies minor, I have participated in many academic conversations on diversity and social justice. Coming from a sheltered, relatively homogenous community, these conversations exposed me to issues and topics I had never really considered. I feel that my coursework in this area has not only made me a more informed citizen and prepared me for a more conscious and empathetic adult life, they have developed my academic abilities overall. However, as a Business Leadership major, I am not able to continue these conversations into the majority of my classes because few, if any, of my classmates have the tools to think critically about race, gender, socio-economic background, and other issues of diversity. I believe that enabling students to carry these issues across the disciplines will encourage the cross disciplinary focus so important to a liberal arts education and Puget Sound.

**Committee on Diversity
2012-2013 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

Committee on Diversity Members

Bill Breitenbach (Fall 2012), Lisa Ferrari, John Lear, Mark Martin, Aislinn Melchior, Margi Nowak (Fall 2012), Czarina Ramsay, Amy Ryken (chair), George Tomlin (Spring 2013), Carolyn Weisz, Ryan Coleman (student member, Fall 2012), Hannah Smith (student member, Spring 2013). **Senate Liaison:** Zaixin Hong

Committee Responsibilities and Activities

Committee Responsibilities per the Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charges	Committee Activities
1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus.	--See numbers 2-8 below.
2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.	<p>--Hiring and Retention Data</p> <p>The Committee discussed data about the hiring and retention of tenure-line faculty of color and white faculty over the period from AY 2004-05 to AY 2012-13.¹</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Hiring Rate (Tenure Line) White Faculty 81% (81/100) Faculty of Color: 19% (19/100)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Retention Rate (Tenure Line) (does not include 2012-2013 hires) White Faculty 90.5% (67/74) Faculty of Color 53.3% (8/15)</p> <p>The Committee discussed data about the rates of tenure and promotion of male and female tenure-line faculty over the period AY 2006-2007 to AY 2012-2013.²</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Rates of Tenure 88.5% for men (N=26) 96.6% for women (N=29)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Promotion Separate from Tenure Affirmed 95% of files for men (2 on a subsequent review, N=39) 96% for women (N=25)</p> <p>The Committee has recommended to the Academic Vice President that hiring, retention, and promotion rates be shared in a consistent format.</p>

¹ Source: Office of the Academic Vice President

² Source: Diversity Strategic Plan Fall 2012 Update (http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/425_2012-DSP%20Update.pdf)

	<p>--Diversity Liaison In Summer 2012 Amy Ryken collaborated with Human Resources to develop resources to be included with Search Chair documents to support faculty serving in the diversity liaison role.</p> <p>Percent of departments conducting tenure line searches that designated a diversity liaison. 100% in AY 2012-2013 83% in AY 2011-2012</p> <p>The Committee developed post search follow-up questions for search chairs and diversity liaisons. Dean Bartanen solicited responses. The committee will review responses and made recommendations for better supporting the work of diversity liaisons.</p> <p>--Benefits The Committee reviewed and endorsed a proposal about striving to include health care benefits for employees covering treatment related to gender identity disorder and gender dysphoria. The proposal was also reviewed and endorsed by the Staff Senate and the Faculty Senate.</p>
<p>3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.</p>	<p>--Amy Ryken serves as the Committee on Diversity representative on the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC).</p> <p>--The Committee participated in the interview process for candidates for the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer.</p> <p>--The Committee has worked collaboratively with the Academic Vice President to review hiring and retention data and to support and review the diversity liaison role.</p>
<p>4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.</p>	<p>-- The Committee collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BERT, CWTL, the Chief Diversity Officer, and Multicultural Student Services.</p> <p>-- The Committee reviewed and endorsed the final report of the Undocumented Students Work Group. The committee is collaborating with Donn Marshall and Human Resources to recommend how to include documentation status in the campus definition of social</p>

	<p>diversity.</p> <p>--The Committee collaborated with Ellen Peters, Director of Institutional Research, to develop questions about diversity in the curriculum to be asked during focus groups interviews with graduating seniors.</p>
<p>5. To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code.</p>	<p>--John Lear, Aislinn Melchior, and Amy Ryken facilitated a workshop for new faculty focused on unintended moments of student spotlighting using teaching narratives written by Puget Sound Faculty members and a narrative written by a Puget Sound student.</p> <p>--Amy Ryken participated in two CWTL dialogues. Fall 2012: "Campus Climate: Creating a Culture of Inclusive Excellence and Reflexivity" Spring 2013: "Lift Every Voice: Diversity and the Liberal Arts in the Twenty-First Century"</p>
<p>6. To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about patterns of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.</p>	<p>--BERT was activated in September 2012. Mark Martin and Carolyn Weisz serve as the Committee on Diversity representatives on BERT.</p>
<p>7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</p>	<p>--This document is our annual report.</p>
<p>8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Charge 1. Arrange to have members of the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) share the Campus Climate Survey findings with the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>Charge 2. Formulate recommendations for the Senate based on a review of faculty responses to the Campus Climate Survey.</p>	<p>--Charge 1: The DAC shared the climate survey preliminary report with the Senate in Fall 2012.</p> <p>--Charge 2: The Committee discussed the campus climate survey preliminary report and provided feedback to the DAC. The Committee noted that aggregated patterns may primarily reflect perspectives of students with majority identities because they are represented in greater numbers among respondents. The DAC is in the process of formulating recommendations for the campus.</p>

<p>Charge 3: Research whether and how peer and next step institutions integrate a diversity requirement in the curriculum.</p> <p>Charge 4: Make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum.</p>	<p>Charge 3: See attached report.</p> <p>Charge 4: See attached report. This report has been (or will be shared soon) with the Governing Council of the Student Diversity Center, Deans and Directors, and the Curriculum Committee.</p>
---	--

Suggested Committee on Diversity Charge for 2013-2014

--Make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum

